



State Water Resources Control Board

REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – CLOSURE SECOND REVIEW – SEPTEMBER 2016

Agency Information

Agency Name: Santa Clara County Environmental Health Department (County)	Address: 1555 Berger Drive, Suite 300 San Jose, CA 95112
Agency Caseworker: Gerald O'Regan	Case No.: 08S1W02F07f

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 15712	GeoTracker Global ID: T0608500344
Site Name: Chevron #9-8354	Site Address: 1402 Camden Avenue
	Campbell, CA 95008
Responsible Party: Chevron Environmental	Address: 6101 Bollinger Canyon Road
Management Company	San Ramon, CA 94583
Attn: Eric Frohnapple	
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$0	Number of Years Case Open: 18

To view all public documents for this case available on GeoTracker use the following URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile report.asp?global id=T0608500344

Summary

The Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank (UST) Case Closure Policy (Policy) contains general and media-specific criteria, and cases that meet those criteria are appropriate for closure pursuant to the Policy. This case meets all of the required criteria of the Policy. Highlights of the case follow:

This case is a former commercial fueling facility, currently developed as an active commercial building with fast food services. One 1,000-gallon gasoline UST was removed in November 1987. Approximately 8 cubic yards of impacted soil were excavated to a depth of 11 feet below ground surface (bgs) and disposed offsite in November 1987. An unauthorized release was reported in September 1998 following the removal of four additional USTs (three gasoline and one waste oil) in June 1998. Excavation was conducted to a depth of 20 feet beneath the former USTs. No active remediation was conducted. Since 1998, eight groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and monitored; four wells have been abandoned. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly achieved.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow groundwater. According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no water supply wells or surface water bodies within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary. No other water supply wells have been identified within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary in files reviewed. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. The affected groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future. Other

Chevron #9-8354 1402 Camden Avenue, Campbell

Claim No: 15712

designated beneficial uses of impacted groundwater are not threatened, and it is highly unlikely that they will be, considering these factors in the context of the site setting. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited and stable, and concentrations are decreasing. Corrective actions have been implemented and additional corrective actions are not necessary. Any remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents do not pose a significant risk to human health, safety or the environment.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 1. The
 contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 100 feet in length.
 There is no free product. The nearest water supply well or surface water body is greater
 than 250 feet from the defined plume boundary.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a. The
 maximum benzene concentration in groundwater is less than 100 micrograms per liter
 (µg/L). The minimum depth to groundwater is greater than 5 feet, overlain by soil
 containing less than 100 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) of TPH.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a. Maximum concentrations in soil are less than those in Policy Table 1 for Commercial/Industrial use, and the concentration limits for a Utility Worker are not exceeded. There are no soil sample results in the case record for naphthalene. However, the relative concentration of naphthalene in soil can be conservatively estimated using the published relative concentrations of naphthalene and benzene in gasoline. Taken from Potter and Simmons (1998), gasoline mixtures contain approximately 2 percent benzene and 0.25 percent naphthalene. Therefore, benzene can be used as a surrogate for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Policy Table 1. Therefore, the estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table 1 and the Policy criteria for direct contact by a factor of eight. It is highly unlikely that naphthalene concentrations in the soil, if any, exceed the threshold.

Determination

The Fund Manager has prepared this review summary report summarizing the reasons for this determination, provided the Review Summary Report to the applicable Regional Water Board and Local Oversight Agency Program, as appropriate, with an opportunity for comment on the Review Summary Report.

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code as of the date of the signature of the Fund Manager below, neither the Regional Water Board or the Local Oversight Program shall issue a corrective action directive or enforce an existing corrective action directive for the tank case until the board issues a decision on the closure of the tank case, unless one of the following applies:

- (A) The Regional Water Board or Local Oversight Program agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Fund Manager that there is an imminent threat to human health, safety, or the environment;
- (B) The Regional Water Board or Local Oversight Program agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Fund Manager that other site-specific needs warrant additional directives during the period that the State Board is considering case closure;
- (C) After considering responses to the Review Summary Report and other relevant information, the Fund Manager determines that case closure is not appropriate; or

(D) The Regional Water Board or Local Oversight Program agency closes the tank case but the directives are necessary to carry out case-closure activities.

Want 9/28/16

Walter Bahm, P.E. Date
Water Resources Control Engineer
Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5847

Pat G. Cullen, PG

Senior Engineering Geologist Chief, Technical Review Unit

(916) 341-5684

BLANK

Lisa Babcock, P.G. 3939, C.E.G. 1235 Fund Manager Date